

Serial No. 10/799,423

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 23 2007

Drawing Amendments

There are no amendments to the drawings.

Serial No. 10/799,423

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 23 2007

Remarks

The Office Action of 10/24/2006 rejected claims 29-35 under 35 U.S.C. §101 for reciting non-statutory subject matter. In addition, the Office Action rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Further, the Office Action rejected claims 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as reciting non-statutory subject matter. Also the Office Action rejected claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In addition, the Office Action rejected claims 1, 15, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,975,712 of C. Schnarel et al. (hereafter referred to as Schnarel) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0090980 of R. J. Wilcox, et al. (hereafter referred to as Wilcox). Further, the Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 15-17, 29-30, 34, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,665,375 of R. Forlenza, et al. (hereafter referred to as Forlenza) in view of Schnarel. Also, the Office Action rejected claims 4-14, 18-28, 31-33, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Forlenza in view of Schnarel and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,192,341 of R.J. Wilcox, et al. (hereafter referred to as Wilcox). Also, the Office Action

Serial No. 10/799,423

questioned the cited priority applications. Finally, the Office Action objected to the title of the specification, the abstract of the specification, and the drawings. Claims 2, 3, 8, 16, 17, and 22 are being amended. Claims 1, 15, and 29-36 are being canceled.

Priority

The present application is a Continuation-In-Part application. The Examiner is correct that the parent priority documents do not disclose "emphasizing the status information using visual enhancement". However, the parent priority documents do disclose detailed operations which are utilized in the present application for obtaining the telecommunication terminal status information and for presenting the emphasized status information.

Objection to the Title of the Specification

The title has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

The abstract has been amended to provide greater details concerning the operations disclosed within the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that the amended abstract meets the requirements of M.P.E.P. §608.01(b).

Objection To the Drawings

The specification is being amended to describe elements 404, 406, 604, and 606. Since the specification now describes these elements, the objection to the drawings has been overcome.

Serial No. 10/799,423

Rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Detailed Description section of the present patent application is being amended to provide support for claim 6. The material added to the Detailed Description section does not constitute new matter since the material was recited in claim 6, as originally filed.

Rejection of claims 29-35 under 35 U.S.C. §101

These claims have been canceled.

Rejection of claims 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

These claims have been canceled.

Rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

This claim 36 has been canceled.

Rejection of claims 1, 15, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Schnarel in view of Wilcox

Claims 1, 15, and 29 have been canceled.

Rejection of claims 1-3 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Forlenza in view of Schnarel

Claim 2, as amended, now incorporates the material from canceled claim 1. Amended claim 2 recites:

A method for providing telecommunication terminal status information as enhanced telecommunication terminal status information, comprising:

receiving telecommunication terminal status information by a telecommunication terminal via a network;

establishing communication with the telecommunication terminal via the network by a computer controlling a visual display separate from the telecommunication terminal;

accessing the telecommunication terminal status information from telecommunication terminal by the computer via the network;

emphasizing the accessed telecommunication terminal status information using visual enhancement; and

Serial No. 10/799,423

displaying the emphasized visual telecommunication terminal status information on the visual display.

The specification supports the amendments to claim 2 at page 7, line 16 through page 8, line 4, and page 15, line 7 through page 16, line 11.

At the very least, Forlenza and Schnarel do not singularly or in combination disclose the steps of establishing and accessing as recited in amended claim 2.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 2 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 (b) over Forlenza and Schnarel.

Dependent claim 3 is directly dependent on amended claim 2 and is patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 2.

Claim 16, as amended, and dependent claim 17 are patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 2 and claim 3.

Rejection of claims 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Forlenza in view of Schnarel and further in view of Becker

Dependent claims 4-7 are directly or indirectly dependent on independent claim 2, as amended. Independent claim 2, as amended, is patentable over the cited references since independent claim 2, as amended, has already been shown to be patentable over Forlenza in view of Schnarel under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The Office Action only cited Becker to "expressly address the situation of users with low visual acuity." Hence, independent claim 2, as amended, is

Serial No. 10/799,423

patentable over the cited references. Dependent claims 4-7 are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as independent claim 2, as amended.

Rejection of claims 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Forlenza in view of Schnarel and further in view of Becker

Amended claim 8 incorporates material from canceled claim 1 and recites:

establishing communication with a telecommunication switching system controlling a telecommunication terminal by a computer controlling a visual display separate from the telecommunication terminal;

directly accessing the telecommunication terminal status information from the telecommunication switching system by the computer via a path distinct from that used to transmit the telecommunication terminal status information to the telecommunication terminal;

emphasizing the accessed telecommunication terminal status information using visual enhancement; and

displaying the emphasized visual telecommunication terminal status information on the visual display.

The Office Action implies on page 13 that the step of directly accessing the telecommunication terminal status information from the telecommunication switching system is found in Column 7, lines 5-36. The Office Action states "specifically, Forlenza states that the computer (client) may directly access the status information or have it go through the additional servers as set forth in 7:5-36, therefore it would be obvious that route choice would be whatever implementation was the desirous to the user and applicant has not demonstrated any criticality to this particular feature and Forlinza clearly teaches that the user can do if it is more convenient and/or the like." First, the text cited by the Office

Serial No. 10/799,423

Action does not disclose that the computer may directly access the status information from the telecommunication switching system. The text at Column 7, lines 5-26, states that the public switching system may send the call status codes to the server 134 and that client 138 can retrieve and display the call status codes by accessing server 134. The text at column 7, lines 27-36 states that client 138 can be utilized to make telephone calls. There is no description in the text cited by the Office Action that discloses or suggests that client 138 directly accesses the call status information from the public switch.

With respect to criticality of accessing the telecommunication switching system rather than having the telecommunication switching system first have to transmit the call status information to a server, the answer is that it eliminates the need to have a server; and in addition, the telecommunication switching system does not have to be programmed to transmit the call status information to the server. It is important to realize that only a small number of telephones connected to the telecommunication switching system will require a computer to access the call status information. Hence by allowing the computer to directly access the telecommunication switching system, the processing and programming required of the control computer of the telecommunication switching system is greatly reduced since the control computer does not have to be programmed for

Serial No. 10/799,423

telephones requiring the utilization of a computer to display the call status information.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 8 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 (b) over Forlenza, Schnarel and Becker.

Dependent claims 9-14 are directly dependent on amended claim 8 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 8.

Rejection of claims 22-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Forlenza in view of Schnarel and further in view of Becker

Independent claim 22, as amended, and dependent claims 23-28 are patentable for the same reasons as independent claim 8, as amended, and dependent claims 9-14.

Summary

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request consideration of claims 2, 3, 8, 16, 17, and 22, as amended, reconsideration of the remaining claims, as originally filed, and allowance of these claims.


Although the foregoing is believed to be dispositive of the issues in the application, if the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the telephone

Serial No. 10/799,423

number listed below.

Respectfully,

David Ray Burritt
Cynthia Hiatt
Paul Roller Michaelis
Chacko Thomas

By 
John C. Moran
Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 30,782
303-450-9926

Date: 01/23/2007

John C. Moran, Attorney, P.C.
4120 115th Place
Thornton, CO 80233